

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 23, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in response thereto. Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 19-25, 27, and 29 have been canceled. Claims 1, 7, 10-18, 26, and 28 are pending.

The rejection of claims 1, 7, 10-18, and 26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranalli et al in view of Klein is respectfully traversed. The independent claims have been amended to provide that active connection sessions are maintained between said server and each registered user that is available any a particular time. In addition, it is specified that the data being exchanged is video data. In contrast, Ranalli and Klein are each related to audio data, i.e., the voice portion of a call.

As was previously pointed out, the method of Ranalli is not able to achieve the connection between the requester and the called party under all conditions. For example, if a firewall is in place then a direct connection cannot be made. Therefore, even with knowledge of the other party's IP address, it may be impossible to complete a connection in Ranalli. The claimed invention, however, avoids that problem by relaying data messages through the central server. Moreover, each claim provides that active connection sessions are maintained between said server and each registered user that is available any a particular time. The maintenance of an open session is described throughout the specification (e.g., page 8, lines 17-19). By maintaining an active session from the time that a user registers with the central server, an open channel is maintained through any firewall that may be in place between the user and the central server. Neither Ranalli nor Klein maintain an active session within the data network during all times that a user is available. A firewall in the data networks of either Ranalli or Klein would defeat the establishment of an exchange of video data as is possible for the claimed invention. Therefore, the combination of Ranalli and Klein fails to make obvious the invention as claimed.

The rejection of claim 28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over

-8-
(Serial No. 10/033,813)

Ranalli et al in view of Klein and further in view of Tompkins et al is respectfully traversed. Claims 28 likewise requires maintaining active connection sessions with users who are available to receive video data. This feature is neither shown nor suggested by these three cited references, either alone or in combination. Therefore, claim 28 is therefore allowable.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1, 7, 10-18, 26, and 28 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: March 9, 2006
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900